arXiv:0805.1614v2 [math.CA] 14 Jun 2009

SHAPE PRESERVING PROPERTIES OF GENERALIZED BERNSTEIN OPERATORS ON EXTENDED CHEBYSHEV SPACES

J. M. ALDAZ, O. KOUNCHEV AND H. RENDER

Abstract. We study the existence and shape preserving properties of a generalized Bernstein operator B_n fixing a strictly positive function f_0, and a second function f_1 such that f_1/f_0 is strictly increasing, within the framework of extended Chebyshev spaces U_n. The first main result gives an inductive criterion for existence: suppose there exists a Bernstein operator $B_n : C[a,b] \to U_n$ with strictly increasing nodes, fixing $f_0, f_1 \in U_n$. If $U_n \subset U_{n+1}$ and U_{n+1} has a non-negative Bernstein basis, then there exists a Bernstein operator $B_{n+1} : C[a,b] \to U_{n+1}$ with strictly increasing nodes, fixing f_0 and f_1. In particular, if $f_0, f_1, ..., f_n$ is a basis of U_n such that the linear span of $f_0, .., f_k$ is an extended Chebyshev space over $[a,b]$ for each $k = 0, ..., n$, then there exists a Bernstein operator B_n with increasing nodes fixing f_0 and f_1. The second main result says that under the above assumptions the following inequalities hold

$$B_n f \geq B_{n+1} f \geq f$$

for all (f_0, f_1)-convex functions $f \in C\left[a,b\right]$. Furthermore, $B_n f$ is (f_0, f_1)-convex for all (f_0, f_1)-convex functions $f \in C\left[a,b\right]$.

1. Introduction

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the space of polynomials generated by $\{1, x, \ldots, x^n\}$ on $[a,b]$ is basic in approximation theory and numerical analysis, so generalizations and modifications abound. However, from a numerical point of view it is a well known fact that the Bernstein bases functions $p_{n,k} = x^k \left(1-x\right)^{n-k}$ behave much better and, in the sense of [14], provide optimal stability. The associated Bernstein operator $B_n : C\left[0,1\right] \to U_n$, defined by

$$B_n f\left(x\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} f\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) \binom{n}{k} x^k \left(1-x\right)^{n-k} \tag{1}$$

has been the object of intensive research. As is well known, the polynomials $B_n f$ converge to f uniformly although the convergence might be very slow. More important is the fact

---

The first and last authors are partially supported by Grant MTM2006-13000-C03-03 of the D.G.I. of Spain. The second and third authors acknowledge support within the project "Institutes Partnership" with the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (Bonn) and within the Project DO-02-275 with the NSF of Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: *Primary: 41A35, Secondary 41A50.*

Key words and phrases: *Bernstein polynomial, Bernstein operator, extended Chebyshev space, exponential polynomial.*

that the Bernstein operator B_n reduces the variation and preserves the shape of f. In particular, if f is increasing then $B_n f$ is increasing, while if f is convex then $B_n f$ is convex, see e.g. [13]. And the derivative of $B_n f$ of a function of class C^1 converges uniformly to f', cf. [22], pg. 25. For this reason Bernstein bases and operators are fundamental notions.

In Computer Aided Geometric Design (CADG) one is often interested, for instance, in rendering circumferences and other shapes not given by polynomial functions. It is thus natural to try to extend the preceding theory to more general spaces, containing not only $1, x, \ldots, x^n$, but also, say, sine and cosine functions, while keeping as many of the good properties of Bernstein bases and operators as possible. If one generalizes the space of polynomials of degree at most n by retaining the bound on the number of zeros, one is led to the notion of an *extended Chebyshev space* (or system) U_n of dimension $n+1$ over the interval $[a,b]$: U_n is an $n+1$ dimensional subspace of $C^n([a,b])$ such that each $f \in U_n$ has at most n zeros in $[a,b]$, counting multiplicities, unless f vanishes identically. Recently, a rich mathematical literature has emerged concerning *generalized Bernstein bases* in the framework of extended Chebyshev spaces, see [9], [10], [11], [12], [23], [24], [25], [26], [27], [28], [30], [31], [35].

It is well-known that extended Chebyshev spaces possess *non-negative Bernstein bases*, i.e. collections of non-negative functions $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$, in U_n, such that each $p_{n,k}$ has a zero of order k at a and a zero of order $n-k$ at b, for $k = 0, ..., n$. Assuming that U_n has a non-negative Bernstein basis $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$ over the interval $[a,b]$, it is natural to ask whether one may associate a Bernstein operator $B_n : C[a,b] \to U_n$ with properties analogous to the classical operator defined in (1). We consider operators B_n of the form

$$B_n(f) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} f(t_{n,k})\, \alpha_{n,k} p_{n,k} \tag{2}$$

where the nodes $t_{n,0}, ..., t_{n,n}$ belong to the interval $[a,b]$, and the weights $\alpha_{n,0}, ..., \alpha_{n,n}$ are positive. But it is not obvious how the nodes and weights should be defined. Recall that the classical Bernstein operator reproduces the constant function 1 and the identity function x. We mimic this feature by requiring that B_n fix two functions $f_0, f_1 \in U_n$, i.e. that

$$B_n(f_0) = f_0 \text{ and } B_n(f_1) = f_1, \tag{3}$$

where throughout the paper it is assumed that $f_0 > 0$ and that f_1/f_0 is strictly increasing, unless we explicitly state otherwise. Functions f_0 and f_1 satisfying the preceding conditions form a Haar system, in the terminology of [19, pg. 25]. Following the Editor's suggestion, we shall call (f_0, f_1) a Haar pair. We show in Section 2 that after choosing f_0 and f_1 in U_n, the requirements $B_n(f_0) = f_0$ and $B_n(f_1) = f_1$, if they can be satisfied, uniquely determine the location of the nodes and the values of the coefficients; in other words, there is at most one Bernstein operator B_n of the form (2) satisfying (3) (observe that the only restriction on the nodes is that they belong to $[a,b]$).

The question of existence of a Bernstein operator in the above sense is studied in [1] and [2]. Here we present a new, inductive criterion for the existence of B_n, making this paper for the most part self-contained. Let $f_0, ..., f_n \in C^n [a, b]$ and assume that for each $k = 0, ..., n$, the linear space $U_k := \langle f_0, ..., f_k \rangle$, generated by $f_0, ..., f_k$, is an extended Chebyshev space of dimension $k + 1$. Then, for every $k = 1, ..., n$, there exists a Bernstein operator $B_k : C [a, b] \to U_k$ fixing f_0 and f_1, whose sequence of nodes is strictly increasing and interlaces with the nodes of B_{k-1}, cf. Corollary 7.

Sections 3 and 4 deal with the shape preserving properties of the generalized Bernstein operator B_n. We shall utilize a generalized notion of convexity, (f_0, f_1)-convexity, which, according to [18], p. 376, is originally due to Hopf, in 1926, and was later extensively developed by Popoviciu, especially in the context of Chebyshev spaces. Ordinary convexity corresponds to $(1, x)$-convexity.

Assume there exists a Bernstein operator $B_n : C[a, b] \to U_n$ fixing f_0 and f_1. We shall show that if $f \in C [a, b]$ is (f_0, f_1)-convex, then

$$B_n f \geq f,$$

thus generalizing the same inequality for the standard polynomial Bernstein operator acting on convex functions. Assume next that B_n has strictly increasing nodes, that $U_n \subset U_{n+1}$, and that the latter space has a non-negative Bernstein basis. From the results in Section 2 we know that there exists a Bernstein operator $B_{n+1} : C[a, b] \to U_{n+1}$ fixing f_0 and f_1. In Section 3 we show that

$$B_n f \geq B_{n+1} f \geq f$$

for all (f_0, f_1)-convex functions $f \in C [a, b]$, generalizing once more the corresponding result for the standard polynomial Bernstein operator. In Section 4 we prove that under the preceding hypotheses, B_n preserves (f_0, f_1)-convexity, i.e., $B_n f$ is (f_0, f_1)-convex for all (f_0, f_1)-convex functions $f \in C [a, b]$. A similar result is obtained for the so-called f_0-monotone functions f. These last results follow from the general theory of totally positive bases and their shape preserving properties.

To put in perspective the inductive existence criterion indicated above, Section 5 (specially, Theorem 25) clarifies issues regarding the existence of "good" Bernstein operators, defined using non-decreasing nodes $t_{n,k} \leq t_{n,k+1}$ in a suitable interval. We focus on the linear space $\mathcal{U}_3$ generated by the functions $1, x, \cos x$, and $\sin x$ on $[0, b]$. It is well known that normalized, totally positive bases (such as $\left\{ \binom{n}{k} x^k (1 - x)^{n-k} \right\}_{k=0}^{n}$ in the polynomial case) posses optimality properties from the viewpoint of geometric design and shape preservation (cf. [6], [7], [17]).

It might be though that having such good bases would be enough to define a Bernstein operator fixing 1 and x. But this is not the case. The space $\mathcal{U}_3$ has a normalized, totally positive basis for every $b \in (0, 2\pi)$ (cf. [9], [23]). However, the existence of a Bernstein operator fixing 1 and x imposes the stronger condition $b \in (0, \rho_0]$, where $\rho_0 \approx 4.4934$ is the first positive zero of $b \mapsto \sin b - b \cos b$: When $\rho_0 < b < 2\pi$ it is not possible to find nodes in $[0, b]$ so that 1 and x are fixed by the operator. When $b \in (\pi, \rho_0]$, the nodes do belong to $[0, b]$, but they fail to be non-decreasing. Thus, a Bernstein operator can be defined, but it lacks desirable properties; in particular, it does not preserve convexity. To ensure the existence of a "good", convexity preserving Bernstein operator, the stronger condition $b \leq \pi$ must be imposed, and to have a strictly increasing sequence of nodes we need even more: $b < \pi$.

This paper is essentially self-contained. For simplicity, we consider only real valued functions when dealing with existence questions. Regarding shape preserving properties it is of course natural to consider real-valued rather than complex-valued functions.

We thank the referees and the Editor, both for their very thorough reading of this paper and for their many suggestions, which lead to a substantial rewriting of the present article.

2. Bernstein operators for Extended Chebyshev Spaces.

We now introduce the concept of a *Bernstein basis* and of a *non-negative Bernstein basis* for a linear subspace $U_n \subset C^n[a, b]$ of dimension $n + 1$. In the literature, the expressions "Bernstein like basis" or "B-basis" are often used instead of "Bernstein basis".

Definition 1. *Let $U_n \subset C^n[a, b]$ be a linear subspace of dimension $n + 1$. A Bernstein basis (resp. non-negative Bernstein basis) for U_n is a sequence of functions (resp. non-negative functions) $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$, in U_n, such that each $p_{n,k}$ has a zero of exact order k at a and a zero of exact order $n - k$ at b, for $k = 0, ..., n$.*

By construction, $\left(p_{n,k}^{(i)}(a)\right)_{i,k=0,\ldots,n}$ is a triangular matrix with nonzero diagonal entries. Hence, a Bernstein basis is indeed a *basis* of the linear space U_n. Furthermore, the basis functions are unique up to a non-zero factor, see e.g. Lemma 19 and Proposition 20 in [21].

As we indicated in the introduction, extended Chebyshev spaces always have non-negative Bernstein bases. To make this paper as self-contained as possible, we briefly indicate the reason: Let $\{h_0, ..., h_n\}$ be a basis for U_n. To obtain a nonzero function $p_{n,k}$ with (at least) k zeros at a and (at least) $n - k$ zeros at b, write $p_{n,k} := a_0 h_0 + ... + a_n h_n$. We impose the condition of having k zeros at a (which leads to k equations) and $n - k$ zeros at b (which gives $n - k$ additional equations). Having $n + 1$ variables at our disposal, there is always a non-trivial solution. The assumption that U_n is an extended Chebyshev space guarantees that $p_{n,k}$ has no more than n zeros, so it has exactly k zeros at a and $n - k$ zeros at b. In particular, $p_{n,k}$ is either strictly positive or strictly negative on (a, b). Multiplying by -1 if needed, we obtain a non-negative $p_{n,k}$.

In Proposition 3.2 in [26] it is shown that a subspace $U_n \subset C^n[a, b]$ possesses a Bernstein basis $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$ if and only if every non-zero $f \in U_n$ vanishes at most n times on the *set* $\{a, b\}$ (and not on the interval $[a, b]$). We mention that the existence of a Bernstein basis in a space $U_n \subset C^n[a,b]$ is a rather weak property; e.g. it does not imply the non-negativity of the basis functions $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$, nor the existence of Bernstein bases on subintervals $[\alpha, \beta]$ of $[a,b]$.

The next two results are essential tools and standard techniques in CAGD in the context of degree elevation.

Proposition 2. *Assume that the linear subspaces $U_n \subset U_{n+1} \subset C^{n+1}[a,b]$ possess Bernstein bases $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$, and $p_{n+1,k}, k = 0, ..., n+1$. Then*

$$p_{n,k} = \frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} p_{n+1,k} + \frac{p_{n,k}^{(n-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k+1}^{(n-k)}(b)} p_{n+1,k+1} \tag{4}$$

for each $k = 0, ..., n$.

Proof. Since $p_{n,k} \in U_{n+1}$, the function $p_{n,k}$ is a linear combination of the basis functions $p_{n+1,k}, k = 0, ..., n+1$. Using the fact that $p_{n,k}$ has exactly k zeros at a and $n-k$ zeros at b, we see that $p_{n,k} = \alpha p_{n+1,k} + \beta p_{n+1,k+1}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $p_{n,k}^{(k)} = \alpha p_{n+1,k}^{(k)} + \beta p_{n+1,k+1}^{(k)}$ and inserting $x = a$ yields

$$\alpha = \frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)}.$$

Similarly, $p_{n,k}^{(n-k)} = \alpha p_{n+1,k}^{(n-k)} + \beta p_{n+1,k+1}^{(n-k)}$ and inserting $x = b$ implies that

$$\beta = \frac{p_{n,k}^{(n-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k+1}^{(n-k)}(b)}.$$

□

Lemma 3. *Under the hypotheses of the preceding proposition, assume additionally that the functions in the Bernstein bases are non-negative. Then*

$$\frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{p_{n,k}^{(n-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k+1}^{(n-k)}(b)} > 0 \tag{5}$$

for each $k = 0, ..., n$.

Proof. If $k = 0$ or $k = n$ the assertion is obvious. If $1 \leq k \leq n$, then the first inequality in (5) can be obtained from (4): Divide both sides by $p_{n+1,k}(x)$, and then let $x \downarrow a$. The second inequality follows in an analogous way. Alternatively, (5) can be derived, without using (4), from the well known and elementary fact that if $f \in C^{(k)}(I)$ has a zero of order k at c, then

$$k! \cdot \lim_{x \to c} \frac{f(x)}{(x-c)^k} = f^{(k)}(c). \tag{6}$$

Of course, the same formula holds for one side limits. □

Let $U_n \subset C^n[a,b]$ be a linear subspace of dimension $n+1$ possessing a non-negative Bernstein basis $p_{n,k}, k=0,...,n$. We now introduce the concept of a Bernstein operator fixing a pair of functions:

Definition 4. *We say that a* Bernstein operator $B_n : C[a,b] \to U_n$ *fixing the functions* h *and* g *exists, if there are points* $t_{n,0},...,t_{n,n} \in [a,b]$ *and coefficients* $\alpha_{n,0},...,\alpha_{n,n} > 0$ *such that the operator* $B_n : C[a,b] \to U_n$ *defined by*

$$B_n f = \sum_{k=0}^{n} f(t_{n,k})\,\alpha_{n,k} p_{n,k} \tag{7}$$

has the property that

$$B_n h = h \text{ and } B_n g = g. \tag{8}$$

We say that the sequence of nodes $t_{n,0},...,t_{n,n} \in [a,b]$ *is* strictly increasing *if*

$$t_{n,0} < t_{n,1} < ... < t_{n,n}.$$

While the strict positivity of the coefficients $\alpha_{n,k}$ for $k=0,...,n$ is included in our definition of Bernstein operator, no restrictions are imposed on the nodes, save that they belong to $[a,b]$. For a natural example of a Bernstein operator without strictly increasing nodes, see Proposition 11 below, or Theorem 25, Section 5, in the case $b=\pi$. However, if the nodes fail to be non-decreasing, then the Bernstein operator may behave in a pathological way, lacking convexity preserving properties (cf. Theorem 25).

Two natural questions arise: when is the existence of a Bernstein operator guaranteed? and, is the Bernstein operator unique? It turns out that existence depends on *additional* properties of the space U_n, while uniqueness is easy to establish.

In the development below we always assume that the Bernstein operator fixes a Haar pair (f_0, f_1) (i.e., $f_0 \in U_n$ is strictly positive on $[a,b]$ and $f_1 \in U_n$ is such that the function f_1/f_0 is strictly increasing on $[a,b]$). The terms increasing and decreasing are understood in the non-strict sense. For a constant c positive means $c>0$, while for a function f it means $f \geq 0$. Of course, once a Bernstein operator fixes a pair (f_0, f_1), it fixes every function in its linear span $\langle f_0, f_1 \rangle$.

We will consistently use the following notation. Assume that $p_{j,k}$, $k=0,...,j$, is a Bernstein basis of the space U_j. Given $f_0, f_1 \in U_j$, there exist coefficients $\beta_{j,0},...,\beta_{j,j}$ and $\gamma_{j,0},...,\gamma_{j,j}$ such that

$$f_0(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} \beta_{j,k} p_{j,k}(x) \text{ and } f_1(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} \gamma_{j,k} p_{j,k}(x). \tag{9}$$

The next lemma answers the question of uniqueness positively.

Lemma 5. *Suppose that the linear subspace* $U_n \subset C^n[a,b]$*, where* $n \geq 1$*, possesses a non-negative Bernstein basis* $\{p_{n,k}\}_{k=0}^{n}$*. If there exists a Bernstein operator* $B_n : C[a,b] \to U_n$ *fixing the functions* $f_0, f_1 \in U_n$*, then* $\beta_{n,k} > 0$ *for all* $k = 0, \ldots, n$*, where the coefficients*

$\beta_{n,k}$ are given by (9). Moreover, the nodes of B_n are defined, for $k = 0$ and $k = n$, by $t_{n,0} = a$ and $t_{n,n} = b$, and in general, for $k = 0, \ldots, n$, by

$$t_{n,k} := \left(\frac{f_1}{f_0}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{\gamma_{n,k}}{\beta_{n,k}}\right), \tag{10}$$

with the $\gamma_{n,k}$ given by (9). Furthermore, the coefficients of B_n are defined, for $k = 0, \ldots, n$, by

$$\alpha_{n,k} := \frac{\beta_{n,k}}{f_0(t_{n,k})}. \tag{11}$$

In particular,

$$\alpha_{n,0} = \frac{1}{p_{n,0}(a)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_{n,n} = \frac{1}{p_{n,n}(b)}. \tag{12}$$

Proof. Since $B_n(f_0) = f_0$ and

$$f_0(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \beta_{n,k} p_{n,k}(x), \tag{13}$$

we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} f_0(t_{n,k})\, \alpha_k p_{n,k} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \beta_{n,k} p_{n,k}.$$

This entails that $f_0(t_{n,k})\, \alpha_{n,k} = \beta_{n,k}$, since $\{p_{n,k}\}_{k=0}^{n}$ is a basis, and now (11) follows. Similarly, from $B_n f_1 = f_1$ and

$$f_1(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \gamma_k p_{n,k}(x) \tag{14}$$

we obtain $f_1(t_{n,k})\, \alpha_k = \gamma_{n,k}$. Using $f_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_{n,k} > 0$ we see that $\beta_{n,k} > 0$. Dividing by $f_0(t_{n,k})\, \alpha_{n,k} = \beta_{n,k}$, we find that $t_{n,k}$ satisfies

$$\frac{f_1(t_{n,k})}{f_0(t_{n,k})} = \frac{\gamma_{n,k}}{\beta_{n,k}}, \tag{15}$$

and now, since f_1/f_0 is injective, its inverse exists and we get (10). Next, inserting $x = a$ in (13) and in (14) we obtain $f_0(a) = \beta_0 p_{n,0}(a)$ and $f_1(a) = \gamma_0 p_{n,0}(a)$. Thus

$$\frac{f_1(a)}{f_0(a)} = \frac{\gamma_{n,0}}{\beta_{n,0}},$$

and it follows by injectivity that $t_{n,0} = a$. An entirely analogous argument shows that $t_{n,n} = b$. Since $f_0(a) = \beta_{n,0} p_{n,0}(a) = f_0(a)\alpha_{n,0} p_{n,0}(a)$ and $f_0(b) = \beta_{n,n} p_{n,n}(b) = f_0(b)\alpha_{n,n} p_{n,n}(b)$, (12) follows. □

Lemma 5 tells us that to obtain a Bernstein operator B_n fixing f_0 and f_1, the nodes $t_{n,k}$ must be the ones given by equation (10), and the coefficients $\alpha_{n,k}$ by (11). A simple algebraic manipulation then shows that B_n does fix f_0 and f_1. To construct B_n, the difficulty lies in showing that for $k = 0, ..., n$, the numbers

$$\frac{\gamma_{n,k}}{\beta_{n,k}}$$

belong to the image of $[a, b]$ under f_1/f_0, so the nodes $t_{n,k}$ can be defined. Even if this is the case, it does not follow in general that the nodes are increasing (cf. Theorem 25). It does not seem trivial to characterize the spaces $U_n \subset C^n [a, b]$ for which there exist a Bernstein operator fixing a predetermined Haar pair $f_0, f_1 \in U_n$, cf. [2].

Here we present a new, inductive criterion: Existence of B_n with strictly increasing nodes entails existence of B_{n+1} with strictly increasing nodes. Furthermore, the nodes at level $n + 1$ interlace strictly with the nodes at level n.

Theorem 6. *Suppose that the linear subspaces $U_n \subset U_{n+1} \subset C^{n+1} [a, b]$, where $n \geq 1$, possess non-negative Bernstein bases $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$, and $p_{n+1,k}, k = 0, ..., n + 1$ respectively. If there exists a Bernstein operator $B_n : C [a, b] \to U_n$ fixing the functions $f_0, f_1 \in U_n$, with strictly increasing nodes $a = t_{n,0} < t_{n,1} < ... < t_{n,n} = b$, then there exists a Bernstein operator $B_{n+1} : C [a, b] \to U_{n+1}$ fixing f_0, f_1, with strictly increasing and strictly interlacing nodes $t_{n+1,0}, ..., t_{n+1,n+1}$, that is,*

$$a = t_{n+1,0} = t_{n,0} < t_{n+1,1} < t_{n,1} < t_{n+1,2} < t_{n,2} < \cdots < t_{n+1,n} < t_{n,n} = t_{n+1,n+1} = b. \tag{16}$$

Proof. Let us write $f_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} \beta_{n+1,k} p_{n+1,k}$ and $f_1 = \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} \gamma_{n+1,k} p_{n+1,k}$. By the preceding lemma, if the Bernstein operator $B_{n+1} : C [a, b] \to U_{n+1}$ for (f_0, f_1) exists, then it has the form

$$B_{n+1} f := \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} f (t_{n+1,k}) \alpha_{n+1,k} p_{n+1,k},$$

where the positive coefficients $\alpha_{n+1,k}$ are given by (11) (with $n + 1$ replacing n), and the increasing nodes $t_{n+1,k}$ are given by $t_{n+1,0} = a$, by $t_{n+1,n+1} = b$, and in general, by (10) when $k = 0, \ldots, n + 1$. Thus, we need to show, first, that $\beta_{n+1,0}, ..., \beta_{n+1,n+1} > 0$, in order to get the positivity of the coefficients $\alpha_{n+1,k}$, and second, that

$$\frac{\gamma_{n,k-1}}{\beta_{n,k-1}} < \frac{\gamma_{n+1,k}}{\beta_{n+1,k}} < \frac{\gamma_{n,k}}{\beta_{n,k}} \text{ for } k = 1, ..., n, \tag{17}$$

to obtain the (strict) interlacing property of nodes; note that $\gamma_{n,0}/\beta_{n,0} = \gamma_{n+1,0}/\beta_{n+1,0}$, since both quantities equal $f_1(a)/f_0(a)$, and similarly $\gamma_{n,n}/\beta_{n,n} = \gamma_{n+1,n+1}/\beta_{n+1,n+1}$ (since both quantities equal $f_1(b)/f_0(b)$).

At level n, by assumption the Bernstein operator is defined via the coefficients $\alpha_{n,k} > 0$. Now the argument runs as follows: From the numbers $\alpha_{n,k}$ we obtain the $\beta_{n,k}$, and from these the $\beta_{n+1,k}$, which in turn give us the $\alpha_{n+1,k}$.

Since $\beta_{n,k} = f_0(t_{n,k})\alpha_{n,k}$, it follows that $\beta_{n,k} > 0$. From $f_0(a) = \beta_{n+1,0}p_{n+1,0}(a)$ and $f_0(b) = \beta_{n+1,n+1}p_{n+1,n+1}(b)$ we see that $\beta_{n+1,0} > 0$ and $\beta_{n+1,n+1} > 0$. We show next that for $k = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$\beta_{n+1,k} = \beta_{n,k}\frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} + \beta_{n,k-1}\frac{p_{n,k-1}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}, \tag{18}$$

from which the positivity of $\beta_{n+1,1}, \ldots, \beta_{n+1,n}$ follows by Lemma 3. Applying the index raising formula given by Proposition 2 to $f_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\beta_{n,k}p_{n,k}$, we see that

$$f_0 = \beta_{n,0}\frac{p_{n,k}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}(a)}p_{n+1,0} + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left[\beta_{n,k}\frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} + \beta_{n,k-1}\frac{p_{n,k-1}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}\right]p_{n+1,k}$$

$$+\beta_{n,n}\frac{p_{n,n}(b)}{p_{n+1,n+1}(b)}p_{n+1,n+1},$$

and we obtain (18).

Regarding the interlacing property of nodes, another application of the index raising formula from Proposition 2, this time to $f_1 = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\gamma_{n,k}p_{n,k}$, yields

$$\gamma_{n+1,k} = \gamma_{n,k}\frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} + \gamma_{n,k-1}\frac{p_{n,k-1}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(n+1-k)}(b)} \tag{19}$$

for $k = 1, ..., n$. To show that $\frac{\gamma_{n,k-1}}{\beta_{n,k-1}} < \frac{\gamma_{n+1,k}}{\beta_{n+1,k}}$, or equivalently, that $\gamma_{n,k-1}\beta_{n+1,k} < \gamma_{n+1,k}\beta_{n,k-1}$, we use formulas (18) and (19) to rewrite the latter inequality as

$$\gamma_{n,k-1}\left(\beta_{n,k}\frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} + \beta_{n,k-1}\frac{p_{n,k-1}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}\right) < \left(\gamma_{n,k}\frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} + \gamma_{n,k-1}\frac{p_{n,k-1}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}\right)\beta_{n,k-1}. \tag{20}$$

Simplifying and using $\frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} > 0$ (by Lemma 3), inequality (20) is easily seen to be equivalent to $\frac{\gamma_{n,k-1}}{\beta_{n,k-1}} < \frac{\beta_{n,k}}{\gamma_{n,k}}$, which is true by (10) together with the assumptions that f_1/f_0 is increasing and that $t_{n,k-1} < t_{n,k}$.

Inequality $\frac{\gamma_{n+1,k}}{\beta_{n+1,k}} < \frac{\gamma_{n,k}}{\beta_{n,k}}$ is proven in the same way. □

For the next corollary we *do not* a priori assume that $f_0 > 0$ and f_1/f_0 is strictly increasing, since multiplying by -1 if needed, these properties can be obtained from the other assumptions.

Corollary 7. *Let $f_0, ..., f_n \in C^n[a,b]$, and assume that the linear spaces U_k generated by $f_0, ..., f_k$ are extended Chebyshev spaces of dimension $k+1$ for $k = 0, ..., n$. Then for every $k = 1, ..., n$, there exists a Bernstein operator $B_k : C[a,b] \to U_k$ fixing f_0 and f_1, with strictly increasing nodes and strictly interlacing with those of B_{k-1}.*

Proof. Since U_0 is an extended Chebyshev space over $[a,b]$, the function f_0 has no zeros. Multiplying by -1 if needed, we may assume that $f_0 > 0$. Since $U_1 = \langle f_0, f_1 \rangle$ is an extended Chebyshev space over $[a,b]$ it is easy to see that that f_1/f_0 is either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing. By multiplying f_1 by -1 if needed one may assume that f_1/f_0 is strictly increasing. Let $\{p_{1,0}, p_{1,1}\}$ be a non-negative Bernstein basis for U_1. We define

$$B_1 f := \alpha_{1,0} f\left(a\right) p_{1,0} + \alpha_{1,1} f\left(b\right) p_{1,1}, \tag{21}$$

where $\alpha_{1,0} = 1/p_{1,0}(a)$ and $\alpha_{1,1} = 1/p_{1,1}(b)$. Since both functions $(B_1 f_0 - f_0) \in U_1$ and $(B_1 f_1 - f_1) \in U_1$ have a zero at a and another zero at b, and U_1 is an extended Chebyshev space we see that these functions are zero, so B_1 fixes f_0 and f_1. And now the result follows by inductively applying Theorem 6 to each U_{k+1} in the chain $U_1 \subset U_2 \subset ... \subset U_n$. □

It is well known that given an extended Chebyshev space U_n, one can find functions $f_0, ..., f_n \in C^n\left[a,b\right]$ such that the linear spaces U_k generated by $f_0, ..., f_k$ are extended Chebyshev spaces of dimension $k+1$ for $k = 0, ..., n$, see e.g. Proposition 2.8 of [26] (cf. also Definition 2.4 in [26]). The functions $f_0, ..., f_n$ can be constructed in the following way: first one shows that there exists a strictly larger interval $[a, \beta] \supset [a,b]$ such that U_n is an extended Chebyshev system over $[a, \beta]$ (cf. [26, p. 351]). Take now n different points $\xi_1, ..., \xi_n$ in the open interval (b, β). For each $k = 0, ..., n$ define a non-zero function $f_k \in U_n$ vanishing on $\xi_1, ..., \xi_{n-k}$. Then the linear spaces U_k generated by $f_0, ..., f_k$ are extended Chebyshev spaces over $\left[a,b\right]$. The disadvantage of this procedure is that the choice of the functions f_0 and f_1 cannot be specified in advance, but does depend on the space U_n.

Thus, Corollary 7 implies the next result:

Corollary 8. *Let $n \geq 1$ and let U_n be an extended Chebyshev space over $[a,b]$. Then it is possible to find a Haar pair $f_0, f_1 \in U_n$ and a Bernstein operator $B_n : C\left[a,b\right] \to U_n$ with strictly increasing nodes, such that B_n fixes f_0 and f_1.*

Remark 9. Observe that the hypothesis of Corollary 8 is weaker than that of Corollary 7, and so is the conclusion, since f_0 and f_1 are chosen a posteriori, cf. also the discussion at the beginning of Section 5.

Specializing the preceding results to the case of *exponential polynomials*, the conclusions we obtain in the real case are stronger than those from [1] (however, [1] deals with the more general complex case). The space $E_{(\lambda_0,...,\lambda_n)}$ of *exponential polynomials* with *exponents* $\lambda_0, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$ is defined by

$$E_{(\lambda_0,...,\lambda_n)} := \left\{ f \in C^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}\right) : \left(\frac{d}{dx} - \lambda_0\right) \cdots \left(\frac{d}{dx} - \lambda_n\right) f = 0 \right\}. \tag{22}$$

Exponential polynomials provide natural generalizations of the classical, trigonometric, and hyperbolic polynomials (see [33]), and the $\mathcal{D}$-polynomials considered in [15] and [29].

They also furnish (under additional assumptions) examples of extended Chebyshev spaces recently studied in CAGD for the purpose of representing parametric curves, see [10], [12], [24]. Note in particular that when $\lambda_k = 0$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$, $\lambda_{n+1} = i$ and $\lambda_{n+1} = -i$, we have $E_{(\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_{n+2})} = \langle 1, x, \ldots, x^n, \sin x, \cos x \rangle$, where $\langle g_1, \ldots, g_k \rangle$ denotes the vector space spanned by $g_1, \ldots, g_k$.

It is well known that $E_{(\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_n)}$ is an extended Chebyshev space over any compact interval $[a, b]$, for any choice of $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}$ (this is not true if some of the exponents are complex, but here, we only consider real eigenvalues λ_k; the reader interested in complex exponents may want to consult [1], [2] and [21]).

The results of the present paper give a simple proof of the existence a Bernstein operator with strictly increasing and strictly interlacing nodes, fixing a suitable Haar pair. Let us emphasize that the interlacing property of nodes does not follow from [1].

Theorem 10. *Let $\lambda_0, ..., \lambda_n$ be real numbers, let $a < b$, and for $k = 1, \ldots, n$, let $U_k := E_{(\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_k)}$ over $[a, b]$. If $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1$, we set $f_0(x) := e^{\lambda_0 x}$ and $f_1(x) := xe^{\lambda_0 x}$, while if $\lambda_0 \neq \lambda_1$, we set $f_0(x) := e^{x \min\{\lambda_0,\lambda_1\}}$ and $f_1(x) := e^{x \max\{\lambda_0,\lambda_1\}}$. Then for each $k = 1, ..., n$, there is a Bernstein operator $B_k : C[a, b] \to E_{(\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_k)}$ fixing f_0 and f_1, such that its sequence of nodes is strictly increasing, and those at level $k > 1$ strictly interlace with the nodes of B_{k-1}.*

Proof. It immediately follows from (22) that $E_{(\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_n)}$ is invariant under permutations of the eigenvalues λ_i, so we can assume, with no loss of generality, that $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1$. Note that if $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1$, then $U_1 = E_{(\lambda_0,\lambda_0)} = \langle f_0, f_1 \rangle$. Whether we have $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1$ or $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1$, $f_0 > 0$ and f_1/f_0 is strictly increasing. Since the spaces $U_k = E_{(\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_k)}$ over $[a, b]$ are extended Chebyshev spaces for each $k = 0, ..., n$, the result immediately follows from Corollary 7. □

We finish this section with a proposition illustrating our methods in the *classical* polynomial case. The article [20] exhibits a sequence of positive linear operators converging to the identity on $C[0, 1]$ and fixing 1 and x^2. This sequence is obtained by replacing x in (1) with a suitably chosen function $r_n(x)$ such that $\lim_n r_n(x) = x$. It is also possible to fix 1 and x^2 by using the generalized Bernstein operators considered here. As a matter of fact, it is possible to fix $f_0(x) = 1$ and $f_1(x) = x^j$ for any $j \geq 1$ we wish (of course, if $j = 1$ we have the standard case). From Lemma 5 we know how to determine the nodes and the coefficients, i.e., how B_n must be constructed.

On the other hand, we *cannot* use Corollary 7 to conclude that such a Bernstein operator $B_{n,0,j}$ exists (the subscripts 0 and j refer to the exponents of the functions being fixed) since whenever $j > 1$, the space $U_1 = \langle 1, x^j \rangle$ is not an extended Chebyshev space over the *closed* interval $[0, 1]$: x^j has a zero of order j. And unlike the situation considered in Theorem 6, the sequence of nodes we obtain is not strictly increasing: given $1 < j \leq n$, it is easy to see that $t_{n,0} = \cdots = t_{n,j-1} = 0$, simply by counting zeros at $a = 0$, or by the argument given below.

Proposition 11. *Fix $j > 1$, and let U_n be the space of polynomials over $[0,1]$ of degree at most n. For every $n \geq j$, there exists a Bernstein operator $B_{n,0,j} : C[0,1] \to U_n$ that fixes 1 and x^j, and converges in the strong operator topology to the identity, as $n \to \infty$. The operator $B_{n,0,j}$ is explicitly given by*

$$B_{n,0,j}f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} f\left(\left(\frac{k(k-1)\cdots(k-j+1)}{n(n-1)\cdots(n-j+1)}\right)^{1/j}\right)\binom{n}{k}x^k(1-x)^{n-k}.$$

Proof. For the purposes of this argument we set $p_{n,k}(x) := \binom{n}{k}x^k(1-x)^{n-k}$ (this differs from the notation used in the introduction for the classical Bernstein polynomials, but it is more convenient here). The condition $1 = B_{n,0,j}1(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\alpha_{n,k}p_{n,k}$ entails that $\alpha_{n,k} = 1$ for all n, k. We use the equality $x^j = B_{n,0,j}x^j$ to determine the nodes $t_{n,k}$. Writing

$$x^j = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\gamma_{n,k}p_{n,k},$$

by (10) we have $t_{n,k} = \gamma_{n,k}^{1/j}$. The coefficients $\gamma_{n,k}$ can be obtained in several ways. A rather direct one follows next:

$$x^j = x^j(x+1-x)^{n-j} = x^j\sum_{k=0}^{n-j}\binom{n-j}{k}x^k(1-x)^{n-j-k}$$

$$= \sum_{k=j}^{n}\binom{n-j}{k-j}x^k(1-x)^{n-k} = \sum_{k=j}^{n}\frac{k(k-1)\cdots(k-j+1)}{n(n-1)\cdots(n-j+1)}\binom{n}{k}x^k(1-x)^{n-k}.$$

Thus, $\gamma_{n,k} = 0$ if $0 \leq k < j$ and

$$\gamma_{n,k} = \frac{k(k-1)\cdots(k-j+1)}{n(n-1)\cdots(n-j+1)} \tag{23}$$

when $j \leq k \leq n$. Originally, we found $\gamma_{n,k}$ using Lemma 5, but an anonymous referee tells us that equation (23) is well known and can be obtained by blossoming (cf. [32] for an introduction to blossoms). And the Editor adds that the coefficients can also be determined via the dual functionals for B-splines. Apparently, though, the coordinates $\gamma_{n,k}$ of x^j with respect to the Bernstein basis had not previously been used as we do here, to define a Bernstein operator fixing 1 and x^j.

Next we prove convergence. For $l = 1, \ldots, j-1$, the inequalities

$$\frac{k-j+1}{n} < \frac{k-l}{n-l} < \frac{k}{n}$$

can be checked by simplifying and inspection. It follows that $((k-j+1)/n)^j < t_{n,k}^j = \gamma_{n,k} < (k/n)^j$, or equivalently, that $0 < k/n - t_{n,k} < (j-1)/n$. Thus, $B_{n,0,j}x^m$ converges uniformly to x^m for $m = 0, 1, 2$, and by Korovkin's Theorem, $B_{n,0,j}f \to f$ uniformly for all $f \in C[0,1]$. □

3. Generalized convexity

Let B_n denote the classical Bernstein operator defined in (1). W.B. Temple showed in [34] that for a convex function f the following monotonicity property

$$B_n f(x) \geq B_{n+1} f(x) \tag{24}$$

holds for all $x \in [0,1]$. In [4] O. Aramă proved that

$$B_n f(x) - B_{n+1} f(x) = \frac{x(1-x)}{n(n+1)} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left[\frac{k}{n}, \frac{k+1}{n+1}, \frac{k+1}{n}\right] f \cdot \binom{n-1}{k} x^k (1-x)^{n-1-k}$$

where $\left[\frac{k}{n}, \frac{k+1}{n+1}, \frac{k+1}{n}\right] f$ is the divided difference of second order, thus providing a simple proof of Temple's result. A similar formula (see Theorem 7.5 in [19]) is due to Averbach. We obtain analogous results for the generalized Bernstein operators considered here. These generalized Bernstein operators B_n fix f_0 and f_1 instead of 1 and x, so rather than $(1,x)$-convexity, which is equivalent to standard convexity, the adequate notion for our purposes is (f_0, f_1)-convexity, to be defined next. We shall see that for (f_0, f_1)-convex functions f, the following holds: $B_n f \geq B_{n+1} f \geq f$.

Next we specialize the definition given in [19, p. 280] for an arbitrary number n of functions to the case $n = 2$. Later we will specialize it to the case $n = 1$.

Definition 12. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$. A function $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ is called* convex on E with respect to *a Haar pair (f_0, f_1) if for all x_0, x_1, x_2 in E with $x_0 < x_1 < x_2$, the determinant*

$$\operatorname{Det}_{x_0,x_1,x_2}(f) := \det \begin{pmatrix} f_0(x_0) & f_0(x_1) & f_0(x_2) \\ f_1(x_0) & f_1(x_1) & f_1(x_2) \\ f(x_0) & f(x_1) & f(x_2) \end{pmatrix} \tag{25}$$

is non-negative. We shall also use the shorter expression "(f_0, f_1)-convex". Likewise, we say that f is (f_0, f_1)-concave if $-f$ is (f_0, f_1)-convex, and (f_0, f_1)-affine if $f \in \langle f_0, f_1 \rangle$.

Remark 13. Note that the condition $\operatorname{Det}_{x_0,x_1,x_2}(f) \geq 0$ for all x_0, x_1, x_2 in E with $x_0 < x_1 < x_2$ is equivalent to the same requirement but with $x_0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2$. Of course, in the degenerate case $x_i = x_{i+1}$ the determinant is zero, so it makes no difference whether or not this possibility is included in the definition. In other words, only the ordering of the points x_0, x_1, x_2 actually matters.

One of the standard definitions of convexity stipulates that the graph of f must lie below the segment joining any two given points on the graph. It is well known that an analogous characterization holds for (f_0, f_1)-convex functions, but with affine functions being replaced by (f_0, f_1)-affine functions. More precisely,

Proposition 14. *Let (f_0, f_1) be a Haar pair. Denote by $\psi^f_{x_0,x_2}$ the unique function in $U_1 := \langle f_0, f_1 \rangle$ that interpolates f at the points $x_0 < x_2$, $x_0, x_2 \in [a,b]$, i.e., $\psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(x_0) =$*

$f(x_0)$ and $\psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(x_2) = f(x_2)$. Then f is (f_0, f_1)-convex if and only if for all x_0, x, x_2 such that $a \le x_0 < x < x_2 \le b$,

$$f(x) \le \psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(x), \tag{26}$$

and in this case, for all $y \in [a,b] \setminus [x_0, x_2]$,

$$f(y) \ge \psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(y). \tag{27}$$

Proof. Let $\mathrm{Det}_{x_0,x,x_2}(f)$ be as defined in (25). Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Det}_{x_0,x,x_2}(f) &= \mathrm{Det}_{x_0,x,x_2}\left(f - \psi^f_{x_0,x_2}\right)\\ &= -\left(f(x) - \psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(x)\right)\left(f_1(x_2) f_0(x_0) - f_0(x_2) f_1(x_0)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since f_1/f_0 is strictly increasing, $f_1(x_2) f_0(x_0) - f_0(x_2) f_1(x_0) > 0$, so $\mathrm{Det}_{x_0,x,x_2}(f) \ge 0$ is equivalent to $f(x) \le \psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(x)$.

Next, assume that (26) holds for all x_0, x, x_2 such that $a \le x_0 < x < x_2 \le b$. Suppose that for some $u \in [a,b] \setminus [x_0, x_2]$ we have $f(u) < \psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(u)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $x_2 < u$. We interpolate between x_0 and u to obtain a contradiction: $\psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(x_0) = \psi^f_{x_0,u}(x_0)$, while $\psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(u) > \psi^f_{x_0,u}(u)$. Since $\psi^f_{x_0,x_2} - \psi^f_{x_0,u}$ has exactly one zero, it follows that $\psi^f_{x_0,x_2} > \psi^f_{x_0,u}$ on $(x_0, b]$. In particular, $f(x_2) = \psi^f_{x_0,x_2}(x_2) > \psi^f_{x_0,u}(x_2)$, which is impossible by (26) applied to f and $\psi^f_{x_0,u}$. □

Note that by inequality (26), convexity is the same as $(1,x)$-convexity. The next result generalizes to (f_0, f_1)-convex functions, the familiar inequality $B_n f \ge f$ for the classical Bernstein operator acting on convex functions. Here it is not assumed that B_n is defined via an increasing sequence of nodes; it is enough to know that $t_{n,k} \in [a,b]$.

Theorem 15. *Assume that for some $n \ge 1$, there is a Bernstein operator B_n fixing f_0 and f_1. Then for every (f_0, f_1)-convex function $f \in C[0,1]$ we have $B_n f \ge f$.*

Proof. Suppose B_n exists for some $n \ge 1$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. We show that for an arbitrary $x \in [a,b]$, $B_n f(x) \ge f(x) - \varepsilon$. Assume that $x \in (a,b)$ (the cases $x = a$ and $x = b$ can be proven via obvious changes in the notation, or just by using continuity). First, select $\delta > 0$ such that $B_n \delta < \varepsilon$. Next, by continuity of f, choose $h > 0$ so small that $[x-h, x+h] \subset [a,b]$ and $\psi^f_{x-h,x+h} < f + \delta$ on $[x-h, x+h]$. Then $\psi^f_{x-h,x+h} < f + \delta$ on $[a,b]$ by (27), so

$$B_n f(x) > B_n\left(\psi^f_{x-h,x+h} - \delta\right)(x) = B_n \psi^f_{x-h,x+h}(x) - B_n \delta(x) > \psi^f_{x-h,x+h}(x) - \varepsilon \ge f(x) - \varepsilon,$$

where for the last inequality we have used (26). □

We shall use below the following characterization of (f_0, f_1)-convexity, due to M. Bessenyei and Z. Páles (cf. Theorem 5, p. 388 of [5]). While the result is stated there for open intervals, it also holds for compact intervals. Note that what we call here a Haar pair (i.e., f_0 is strictly positive and f_1/f_0 strictly increasing) is called in [5] a positive regular pair.

Theorem 16. *Let* (f_0, f_1) *be a Haar pair and let* $I := (f_1/f_0)([a,b])$. *Then* $f \in C[a,b]$ *is* (f_0, f_1)*-convex if and only if* $(f/f_0) \circ (f_1/f_0)^{-1} \in C(I)$ *is convex in the standard sense.*

Example 17. Consider the Bernstein operator $B_{n,0,j}$ from Proposition 11, defined on $C[0,1]$ and fixing 1 and x^j. It is easy to see from Theorem 16 that for $s \in (0,j)$, the function x^s is $(1, x^j)$-concave, while if $s \in (j, \infty)$, x^s is $(1, x^j)$-convex. Therefore, by Theorem 15, for all $x \in [0,1]$ we have $B_{n,0,j}x^s \leq x^s$ if $s \in (0,j)$ and $B_{n,0,j}x^s \geq x^s$ when $s \in (j, \infty)$.

Our next objective is to obtain an analog of Aramă's result (presented at the beginning of this section) for generalized Bernstein operators B_n. Here the interlacing property of nodes is used in an essential way.

Proposition 18. *Let* $s_k, s_{k+1}, s_{k+2} \in [a,b]$ *be such that* $s_k < s_{k+1} < s_{k+2}$, *and assume that* $G_k : C[c,d] \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a functional of the form*

$$G_k(f) = a_k f(s_k) + b_k f(s_{k+1}) + c_k f(s_{k+2}),$$

satisfying $G_k(f_0) = G_k(f_1) = 0$. *Then* $b_k \geq 0$ *if an only if* $G_k(f) \leq 0$ *for all* (f_0, f_1)*-convex functions* $f \in C[t_k, t_{k+2}]$.

Proof. Let f be (f_0, f_1)-convex, and let $\psi^f_{s_k, s_{k+2}}$ be the function in $\langle f_0, f_1 \rangle$ that interpolates f at the points s_k and s_{k+2}. By (26),

$$G_k(f) = G_k\left(f - \psi^f_{s_k, s_{k+2}}\right) = b_k\left(f - \psi^f_{s_k, s_{k+2}}\right)(s_{k+1}) \leq 0$$

if and only if $b_k \geq 0$. □

Theorem 19. *Under the same hypotheses and with the same notation as in Theorem 6, let the linear functionals* $G_k, k = 1, ..., n-1$, *be defined by*

$$G_k(f) = f(t_{n,k})\,\alpha_{n,k}\frac{p^{(k)}_{n,k}(a)}{p^{(k)}_{n+1,k}(a)} - f(t_{n+1,k})\,\alpha_{n+1,k} + f(t_{n,k-1})\,\alpha_{n,k-1}\frac{p^{(n+1-k)}_{n,k-1}(b)}{p^{(n+1-k)}_{n+1,k}(b)}.$$

Then

$$B_n f - B_{n+1} f = \sum_{k=1}^{n} G_k(f) \cdot p_{n+1,k}.$$

In particular, if f *is* (f_0, f_1)*-convex then* $B_n f - B_{n+1} f \geq 0$.

Proof. Recall that

$$B_n f = \sum_{k=0}^{n} f(t_{n,k})\,\alpha_{n,k} p_{n,k} \text{ and } B_{n+1} f = \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} f(t_{n+1,k})\,\alpha_{n+1,k} p_{n+1,k}$$

where $t_{n,0} = t_{n+1,0} = a$, $t_{n,n} = t_{n+1,n+1} = b$, and $t_{n,k-1} < t_{n+1,k} < t_{n,k}$ for $k = 1, ..., n$. Using Proposition 2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B_n f - B_{n+1} f &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} f\left(t_{n,k}\right) \alpha_{n,k} \frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} p_{n+1,k} \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{n} f\left(t_{n,k}\right) \alpha_{n,k} \frac{p_{n,k}^{(n-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k+1}^{(n-k)}(b)} p_{n+1,k+1} - \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} f\left(t_{n+1,k}\right) \alpha_{n+1,k} p_{n+1,k}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (12) that the first summands (corresponding to $k = 0$) of the first and the last sum are the same, so they cancel out. Likewise, the n-th summand of the second sum and the $(n+1)$-st summand of the last sum cancel out. Thus

$$B_n f - B_{n+1} f =$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} p_{n+1,k} \left[f\left(t_{n,k}\right) \alpha_{n,k} \frac{p_{n,k}^{(k)}(a)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(k)}(a)} - f\left(t_{n+1,k}\right) \alpha_{n+1,k} + f\left(t_{n,k-1}\right) \alpha_{n,k-1} \frac{p_{n,k-1}^{(n+1-k)}(b)}{p_{n+1,k}^{(n+1-k)}(b)} \right].$$

Finally, let f be (f_0, f_1)-convex. Taking $s_k = t_{n,k-1}, s_{k+1} = t_{n+1,k}$, and $s_{k+2} = t_{n,k}$ in Proposition 18, we get $B_n f - B_{n+1} f \geq 0$. □

A very natural question, not touched upon here, is under which conditions a sequence of Bernstein operators for (f_0, f_1) converges to the identity. It follows from Theorems 15 and 19 that if f is (f_0, f_1)-convex, then the sequence $\{B_n f\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ monotonically converges to some function $g \geq f$ (assuming that a sequence of functions $f_0, f_1, f_2, ...$ are given such that $\langle f_0, ..., f_n \rangle$ is an extended Chebyshev space of dimension $n+1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$). But we have not determined which conditions will ensure that $g = f$. In this regard, we expect the strict interlacing property of nodes to be useful, since it entails, in a qualitative sense, that the sampling of functions is not "too biased".

4. TOTAL POSITIVITY AND GENERALIZED CONVEXITY

Let $B_n : C[a,b] \to U_n$ be a Bernstein operator for the pair (f_0, f_1). In Section 3 we proved that $B_n f \geq f$ for all (f_0, f_1)-convex functions $f \in C[a,b]$. This did not require an increasing sequence of nodes; it was enough to know that $t_{n,k} \in [a,b]$.

In this section we show that $B_n f$ is (f_0, f_1)-convex for every (f_0, f_1)-convex function $f \in C[a,b]$, provided that the nodes $t_{n,0}, ..., t_{n,n}$ are *increasing* and U_n is an extended Chebyshev space over $[a,b]$, and a similar result holds for the so-called g-monotone functions. These statements follow directly from the more general results presented in [19] concerning shape preserving properties of linear transformations with totally positive kernels. The connection between total positivity and shape preserving properties of bases is a classical subject that has been widely described, see e.g. [19] or the more recent survey [8].

The following definitions come from [19]. Let X and Y be subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. A function $K : X \times Y \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *sign-consistent of order* m if there exists an $\varepsilon_m \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that

$$\varepsilon_m \det \begin{pmatrix} K(x_1, y_1) & K(x_1, y_2) & ... & K(x_1, y_m) \\ K(x_2, y_1) & K(x_2, y_2) & ... & K(x_2, y_m) \\ & & & \\ K(x_m, y_1) & ... & .... & K(x_m, y_m) \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \tag{28}$$

for all $x_1 < x_2 < ... < x_m$ in X and $y_1 < y_2 < ... < y_m$ in Y. If $\varepsilon_m = 1$ we shall call K *positive of order* m. A function K is *totally positive* if it is positive of all orders m with $m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq 1$. Similarly, if one has strict positivity in (28) then K is called *strictly sign-consistent of order* m, and if in addition $\varepsilon_m = 1$, then K is *strictly positive of order* m. Strict total positivity means that K is strictly positive of all orders $m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq 1$.

The following result is well-known, see e.g. [26, p. 358], or the proof presented in [12, pp. 342–344]:

Theorem 20. *Let* $U_n \subset C^n[a, b]$ *be an extended Chebyshev space over* $[a, b]$ *and let* $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n,$ *be a non-negative Bernstein basis for* $[a, b]$. *Then* $K : [a, b] \times \{0, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{R}$, *defined by*

$$K(x, k) := p_{n,k}(x), \tag{29}$$

is totally positive, and K *is strictly totally positive on* $(a, b) \times \{0, ..., n\}$.

Following the notation of [9], [10], [23], we can deduce from the previous result that a non-negative Bernstein basis of an extended Chebyshev system over $[a, b]$ is totally positive on $[a, b]$, i.e., a B-basis.

We cite from [19, p. 284] the following result (specialized to the case of two functions F_0, F_1 instead of a family $F_1, ..., F_m$).

Theorem 21. *Let* X *and* Y *be subsets of* $\mathbb{R}$, *let* F_0, F_1 *be functions on* Y *and let* $K : X \times Y \to \mathbb{R}$ *be continuous, and positive of order* 3. *Let* μ *be a non-negative sigma-finite measure and* $B_K : C(Y) \to C(X)$ *be defined by*

$$B_K(F)(x) := \int_Y K(x, y) F(y) \, d\mu(y).$$

If F *is* (F_0, F_1)*-convex, then* $B_K(F)$ *is* $(B_K F_0, B_K F_1)$*-convex.*

From this we conclude:

Theorem 22. *Let* U_n *be an extended Chebyshev space over* $[a, b]$. *Assume there exists a Bernstein operator* $B_n : C[a, b] \to U_n$ *fixing* f_0 *and* f_1, *with increasing nodes* $t_{n,0} \leq .... \leq t_{n,n}$. *If* $f \in C[a, b]$ *is* (f_0, f_1)*-convex, then* $B_n(f)$ *is* (f_0, f_1)*-convex.*

Proof. Put $X=[a,b]$ and $Y:=\{0,....,n\}$. Define the function $\varphi:Y\rightarrow X$ by $\varphi(k):=t_{n,k}$, for $k=0,...,n$. Observe that φ is monotone increasing (though perhaps not strictly), so it is order preserving. Next, set $\mu:=\sum_{k=0}^{n}\alpha_{n,k}\delta_{k}$, where the $\alpha_{n,k}$ are the positive coefficients defining B_n and δ_k is the Dirac measure at the point $k\in\{0,...,n\}$. With $K(x,k):=p_{n,k}(x)$, we obtain, for every $F\in C(Y)$,

$$B_K(F)(x):=\int_Y K(x,y)F(y)\,d\mu(y)=\sum_{k=0}^{n}F(k)\,\alpha_{n,k}p_{n,k}(x).$$

Now let $f\in C(X)$, and define $F:=f\circ\varphi\in C(Y)$. Then

$$B_K(f\circ\varphi)(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{n}f(t_{n,k})\,\alpha_{n,k}p_{n,k}(x)=B_n(f)(x). \tag{30}$$

If $f\in C(X)$ is (f_0,f_1)-convex, then $F=f\circ\varphi$ is $(f_0\circ\varphi,f_1\circ\varphi)$-convex, since φ preserves order (cf. Remark 13). Putting $F_j=f_j\circ\varphi$ for $j=0,1$, an application of Theorem 21 shows that $B_K(F)$ is (B_KF_0,B_KF_1)-convex. By formula (30) and the property that B_n fixes f_0 and f_1 one obtains

$$B_KF_j=B_n(f_j)=f_j$$

for $j=0,1$. Thus $B_K(F)=B_n(f)$ is (f_0,f_1)-convex. □

In a similar way it is possible to obtain generalized monotonicity properties of the Bernstein operator.

Definition 23. *Let $g>0$. We say that f is g-increasing on $[a,b]$ if f/g is increasing on $[a,b]$, i.e. if*

$$\frac{f(x_0)}{g(x_0)}\leq\frac{f(x_1)}{g(x_1)}$$

for all $x_0<x_1$ in $[a,b]$.

The notions of g-decreasing and g-monotone are the obvious ones. Now $f:[a,b]\rightarrow\mathbb{R}$ is g-increasing on $[a,b]$ if and only if for all x_0,x_1 in $[a,b]$ with $x_0<x_1$ the determinant

$$\det\begin{pmatrix} g(x_0) & g(x_1)\\ f(x_0) & f(x_1)\end{pmatrix}$$

is non-negative. But this condition is just the definition of convexity with respect to one function (the function g), obtained by specializing to $n=1$ the definition given in [19, p. 280]. Specializing also Theorem 3.3 in [19, p. 284] to one function (cf. Theorem 21 above in the case of two functions) and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 22, we obtain:

Theorem 24. *Let U_n be an extended Chebyshev space over $[a,b]$. Assume that there exists a Bernstein operator $B_n:C[a,b]\rightarrow U_n$ with increasing nodes $t_{n,0}\leq....\leq t_{n,n}$, fixing f_0 and f_1. If $g\in\langle f_0,f_1\rangle$ is strictly positive and $f\in C[a,b]$ is g-monotone, then $B_n(f)$ is g-monotone.*

One of the referees points out that Theorems 24 and 22 can be proven without referring to Theorem 3.3 in [19, p. 284], using instead elementary shape preserving properties of totally positive bases, as described in the surveys [8] and [17]. Moreover, Theorems 24 and 22 in the special case $f_0 = 1$ and $f_1(x) = x$ follow immediately from [17, Corollaries 3.7 and 3.8, p. 162].

5. Normalized Bernstein bases and existence of Bernstein operators

Let $b_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$, be a basis of a given subspace $U_n \subset C[a,b]$ of dimension $n+1$. The basis $b_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$ is *totally positive* if the kernel $K(x,k) := b_{n,k}(x)$ is totally positive (in particular, the functions $b_{n,k}$ are non-negative). Suppose now that U_n contains the constant function 1. Then the basis $b_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$ is called *normalized* if

$$1 = \sum_{k=0}^{n} b_{n,k}(x)$$

for all $x \in [a,b]$. Normalized totally positive bases are important in geometric design due to their good shape preserving properties. J.-M. Carnicer and J.-M. Peña have shown that normalized, totally positive Bernstein bases are optimal from the shape preservation viewpoint, see [6], [7], [17]. Moreover it was proven in [9], and independently in [26], that a subspace U_n of $C^n[a,b]$ of dimension $n+1$ containing the constant functions, possesses a normalized, totally positive Bernstein basis, provided that *both* U_n and the space of all derivatives $U_n' := \{f' : f \in U_n\}$ are extended Chebyshev spaces over $[a,b]$.

From this point of view it is natural to conjecture that to define a well-behaved Bernstein operator (with increasing nodes) fixing f_0 and f_1, it is enough to assume that U_n possesses a normalized totally positive Bernstein basis and that $\langle f_0 \rangle, \langle f_0, f_1 \rangle$ are extended Chebyshev systems. However, we shall show by a counterexample that this is not true. We refer to [2] for a more detailed discussion under which conditions there might exist a Bernstein operator fixing a pair $f_0, f_1 \in U_n$.

Consider the linear space $\mathcal{U}_3 := \langle 1, x, \cos x, \sin x \rangle$ over the interval $[0,b]$. This space has been previously studied by several authors, see the references in [9] or [23]. It is well known that $\mathcal{U}_3$ and $\mathcal{U}_3'$ (the space of all derivatives of functions in $\mathcal{U}_3$) are extended Chebyshev spaces over $[0,b]$ for every $b \in (0, 2\pi)$. Thus $\mathcal{U}_3$ possesses a normalized totally positive Bernstein basis for every $b \in (0, 2\pi)$. By [9] this entails that the critical length of $\mathcal{U}_3$ for design purposes is 2π. However, we show in Theorem 25 that for b sufficiently close to 2π (say, $b \geq 4.5$) there is no Bernstein operator from $C[0,b]$ to $\mathcal{U}_3$ fixing 1 and x.

The obstruction for employing Corollary 7 is due to the fact that neither $\langle 1, x, \cos x \rangle$ nor $\langle 1, x, \sin x \rangle$ are extended Chebyshev spaces over $[0,b]$ for all $b < 2\pi$ (for instance, $\sin x - x$ has a zero of order 3 at 0) so the chain of nested spaces cannot be continued beyond $U_1 = \langle 1, x \rangle$. By Corollary 8, it is nevertheless possible to construct a Bernstein operator fixing *some* Haar pair of functions $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{U}_3' = \langle 1, \cos x, \sin x \rangle$. Hence, by

Theorem 6 there is a corresponding Bernstein operator from $C[0,b]$ to $\mathcal{U}_3$, fixing g_0 and g_1, with strictly interlacing nodes.

Theorem 25. *Given $b \in (0,2\pi)$, let ρ_0 be the first positive root of $b \mapsto \sin b - b\cos b$, ($\rho_0 \approx 4.4934$). Let $\mathcal{U}_3 = \langle 1, x, \cos x, \sin x\rangle$, $f_0 = 1$, and $f_1(x) = x$. Then for every $b \in (0,\rho_0]$ there exists a Bernstein operator $B_3 : C[0,b] \to \mathcal{U}_3$ fixing 1 and x. The nodes $t_0(b), t_1(b), t_2(b)$, and $t_3(b)$ satisfy the following inequalities:*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= t_0(b) < t_1(b) < t_2(b) < t_3(b) = b \text{ for } b \in (0,\pi) \\ 0 &= t_0(b) < t_1(b) = \pi/2 = t_2(b) < t_3(b) = b \text{ for } b = \pi \\ 0 &= t_0(b) < t_2(b) < t_1(b) < t_3(b) = b \text{ for } b \in (\pi,\rho_0). \end{aligned}$$

The operator B_3 preserves convex functions whenever $b \in (0,\pi]$, but not for $b \in (\pi,\rho_0]$. Finally, if $b \in (\rho_0, 2\pi)$, then there does not exist a Bernstein operator fixing 1 and x.

To keep computations simple we shall present first two general propositions and a definition: We say that a subspace $U_n \subset C[a,b]$ is *symmetric* if $f \in U_n$ implies that the function F defined by $F(x) := f(a+b-x)$ is in U_n.

Assume that $U_n \subset C^n[a,b]$ is a symmetric, extended Chebyshev space over $[a,b]$. Let $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$ be a non-negative Bernstein basis of U_n, and let $\beta_0, ..., \beta_n$ and $\gamma_0, ..., \gamma_n$ be constants such that $1 = \sum_{k=0}^n \beta_k p_{n,k}(x)$ and $x = \sum_{k=0}^n \gamma_k p_{n,k}(x)$ for all $x \in [a,b]$.

Proposition 26. *Suppose that $U_n \subset C^n[a,b]$ is a symmetric, extended Chebyshev space over $[a,b]$ containing the constant function $f_0 = 1$ and the identity function $f_1(x) = x$. If there exists a Bernstein operator B_n fixing f_0 and f_1, then the following equalities hold for the coefficients β_k and the nodes $t_{n,k}$, whenever $k = 0, ..., n$:*

$$\beta_k = \beta_{n-k} \quad \text{and} \quad t_{n,k} + t_{n,n-k} = a + b. \tag{31}$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{U}_n := \{f(a+b-x) : f \in U_n\}$. Given $g \in \tilde{U}_n$, define $\tilde{B}_n g(x) := B_n g(a+b-x)$. Since by symmetry $\tilde{U}_n = U_n$, and both operators $\tilde{B}_n$ and B_n fix the affine functions on $[a,b]$, by uniqueness of the Bernstein operator we have $\tilde{B}_n = B_n$. Thus, $B_n f(x) = B_n f(a+b-x)$ for every $f \in U_n$. Likewise, let $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n$ be a non-negative Bernstein basis of U_n. By suitably rescaling we may impose the following normalization:

$$p_{n,k}\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right) = 1 \tag{32}$$

for all $k = 0, ..., n$. Counting zeros at the endpoints, and using uniqueness of the Bernstein basis (up to a normalizing constant), we conclude that

$$p_{n,k}(a+b-x) = p_{n,n-k}(x). \tag{33}$$

And now (31) follows from (33) and the fact that $B_n f(x) = B_n f(a+b-x)$ for every $f \in U_n$. □

Proposition 27. *Let $p_{n,k}, k = 0, ..., n,$ be a Bernstein basis, and for $f \in U_n$ let $\beta_0, ..., \beta_n$ be the coefficients in the expression*

$$f = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \beta_k p_{n,k}. \tag{34}$$

Then $p_{n,n}(b)\beta_n = f(b)$ and

$$f'(b) = \beta_{n-1} p'_{n,n-1}(b) + \beta_n p'_{n,n}(b). \tag{35}$$

Proof. For the first statement insert $x = b$ in (34), for the second take the derivative of f in (34) and then insert $x = b$. □

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 25:

Proof. We define a Bernstein basis for $\mathcal{U}_3$ over $[0, b]$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} p_{3,3}(x) &= x - \sin x, \\ p_{3,2}(x) &= (b - \sin b)(1 - \cos x) - (1 - \cos b)(x - \sin x), \\ p_{3,1}(x) &= p_{3,2}(b - x) \text{ and } p_{3,0}(x) = p_{3,3}(b - x). \end{aligned}$$

Let us check that this is indeed a Bernstein basis. We claim that the four given functions are positive on $(0, \pi)$ and have the required number of zeros at the endpoints. This is clear for $p_{3,3}$, and hence for $p_{3,0}$. Regarding $p_{3,2}$, note that it has a zero of order 2 at 0 and another zero at b. Since $\langle 1, x, \cos x, \sin x \rangle$ is an extended Chebyshev space whenever $b \in (0, 2\pi)$, $p_{3,2}$ has at most 3 zeros in $[0, b]$. So it has no zeros in $(0, b)$ and the zero at b is of order exactly one. Since $p''_{3,2}(0) > 0$, $p_{3,2} \geq 0$ on $[0, b]$. Thus, $p_{3,1} \geq 0$ on $[0, b]$.

Recall that Bernstein bases are unique up to multiplicative constants. So to prove that a Bernstein operator does not exist, it is sufficient to consider the preceding basis. On the other hand, to prove that a Bernstein operator does exist, we need to exhibit nodes t_k in $[0, b]$ and positive coefficients α_k, for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Now let $1 = \sum_{k=0}^{3} \beta_k p_{3,k}$ and $x = \sum_{k=0}^{3} \gamma_k p_{3,k}$. Lemma 5 tells us what the nodes and coefficients must be if B_3 exists. By Proposition 27 we have

$$\beta_3 = \frac{1}{b - \sin b} \text{ and } \gamma_3 = \frac{b}{b - \sin b},$$

so $t_3(b) := \gamma_3/\beta_3 = b$. It follows from (35) that

$$\beta_2 p'_{3,2}(b) = -\beta_3 p'_{3,3}(b) \text{ and } \gamma_2 p'_{3,2}(b) = 1 - \gamma_3 p'_{3,3}(b). \tag{36}$$

Thus

$$t_2(b) := \frac{\gamma_2}{\beta_2} = \frac{-\gamma_3 p'_{3,3}(b)}{-\beta_3 p'_{3,3}(b)} + \frac{1}{-\beta_3 p'_{3,3}(b)} = b - \frac{b - \sin b}{1 - \cos b}.$$

Now (31) implies that

$$t_1(b) = \frac{b - \sin b}{1 - \cos b}.$$

We see that $t_2(b) - t_1(b) > 0$ if and only if $g(b) := 2\sin b - b\cos b - b > 0$. Elementary calculus shows that $g > 0$ on $(0, \pi)$, $g(\pi) = 0$, and $g < 0$ (at least) on $(\pi, 3\pi/2)$. If $b = \pi$, then $t_1(\pi) = t_2(\pi) = \pi/2$. Furthermore, $t_2(b) < 0$ whenever $\sin b - b\cos b < 0$, so by Lemma 5, for $b \in (\rho_0, 2\pi)$ there does not exists a Bernstein operator. To see that such operator exists when $b \in (0, \rho_0)$, note that since $f_0 = 1$, by (11) we have $\alpha_k = \beta_k$, so it is enough to show that $\beta_k > 0$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Since $\beta_0 = \beta_3$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ by Proposition 26, and $\beta_3 > 0$, it suffices to prove that $\beta_2 > 0$. Now from equation (36) we get

$$\beta_2 = -\left(\frac{1-\cos b}{b-\sin b}\right)\frac{1}{b\sin b - 2 + 2\cos b},$$

so $\beta_2 > 0$ if and only if $b\sin b - 2 + 2\cos b < 0$. Elementary calculus shows that this is the case for every $b \in (0, 2\pi)$, and in particular, for every $b \in (0, \rho_0]$.

Regarding the convexity assertions, if $b \in (0, \pi]$ then the Bernstein operator B_3 preserves convexity by Theorem 22. Next, fix $b \in (\pi, \rho_0]$, write $t_1 = t_1(b)$, $t_2 = t_2(b)$, and consider the convex function $f(x) = (x - t_1)(x - t_2)$. Since $t_1 + t_2 = b$, we have $f(0) = f(b) = t_1(b - t_1)$. By Proposition 26, $\beta_0 = \beta_3$, so

$$B_3 f(x) = f(0)\beta_0 p_{3,0}(x) + f(b)\beta_3 p_{3,3}(x) = \beta_0 f(0)(p_{3,0}(x) + p_{3,3}(x)).$$

Using $\beta_0 f(0) > 0$ we see that $B_3 f$ is convex if and only if $F := p_{3,0} + p_{3,3}$ is convex. A direct computation shows that $F(x) = b - \sin(b - x) - \sin x$, so

$$F''(x) = \sin(b - x) + \sin x.$$

Thus $F''(0) = \sin b < 0$, since $b \in (\pi, 2\pi)$. By continuity, $F''(x) < 0$ for all x in a small neighborhood of 0, so F is not convex. ☐

We see that non-increasing nodes can lead to pathological behavior on the part of the generalized Bernstein operator defined by them. Thus, either additional conditions are imposed to avoid this situation (in this case, a smaller value of b) or else the requirement that the operator fix 1 and x must be given up. On the other hand, there are natural examples where nodes are increasing, but not strictly. In addition to Proposition 11, where the node at zero is repeated j times, we mention the case $b = \pi$ in Theorem 25. There, the second and third nodes are equal (to $\pi/2$). It is shown in [3] that the generalized Bernstein operator on $\mathcal{U}_3$ approximates some convex functions (such as $|x - \pi/2|$) on $[0, \pi]$ better than the standard polynomial Bernstein operator on $\langle 1, x, x^2, x^3\rangle$ (while the latter operator approximates some other functions better).

References

[1] J. M. Aldaz, O. Kounchev, H. Render, *Bernstein operators for exponential polynomials,* to appear in Constr. Approx..

[2] J. M. Aldaz, O. Kounchev, H. Render, *Bernstein operators for extended Chebyshev systems,* submitted.

[3] J. M. Aldaz, H. Render, *Optimality of generalized Bernstein operators*, submitted.

[4] O. Aramă, *Proprietăţi privind monotonia şi aplicarea lor la studiul aproksimării funcţilor,* Stud. Cerc. Mat. (Cluj) 8 (1957), 195–210.

[5] M. Bessenyei, Z. Páles, *Hadamard-type inequalities for generalized convex functions,* Math. Ineq. Appl. 6 (2003), 379–392.

[6] J.-M. Carnicer, J.-M. Peña, *Shape preserving representations and optimality of the Bernstein basis,* Adv. Comput. Math. 1 (1993), 173–196.

[7] J.-M. Carnicer, J.-M. Peña, *Totally positive bases for shape preserving curve design and optimality of B-splines,* Comput. Aided Geom. Design 11 (1994), 633–654. (1993), 173–196.

[8] J.-M. Carnicer, J.-M. Peña, *Total positivity and optimal bases.* Total positivity and its applications (Jaca, 1994), 133–145, Math. Appl., 359, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1996.

[9] J.-M. Carnicer, E. Mainar, J.M. Peña, *Critical Length for Design Purposes and Extended Chebyshev Spaces,* Constr. Approx. 20 (2004), 55–71.

[10] J.M. Carnicer, E. Mainar, J.M. Peña, *Shape preservation regions for six-dimensional space,* Adv. Comput. Math. 26 (2007), 121–136.

[11] P. Costantini, *Curve and surface construction using variable degree polynomial splines,* Comput. Aided Geom. Design 17 (2000), 419–446.

[12] P. Costantini, T. Lyche, C. Manni, *On a class of weak Tchebycheff systems*, Numer. Math. 101 (2005), 333–354.

[13] P. J. Davis, *Interpolation and Approximation,* Dover Publications, New York 1975.

[14] R.T. Farouki, T.N.T. Goodman, *On the optimal stability of the Bernstein basis,* Math. Comp. 65 (1996), 1553–1566.

[15] D. Gonsor, M. Neamtu, *Null spaces of Differential Operators, Polar Forms and Splines,* J. Approx. Theory 86 (1996), 81–107.

[16] T.N.T. Goodman, M.L. Mazure, *Blossoming beyond Chebyshev spaces,* J. Approx. Theory 109 (2001), 48–81.

[17] T.N.T. Goodman, *Total positivity and the shape of curves,* In: Total Positivity and its Applications (M. Gasca, C.A. Micchelli, eds.). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 157–186.

[18] S. Karlin, W. J. Studden, *Tchebycheff Systems: with applications in Analysis and Statistics.* John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

[19] S. Karlin, *Total positivity, Vol. 1,* Stanford Univ. Press, Standford 1968.

[20] J. P. King, *Positive linear operators which preserve x^2.* Acta Math. Hungar. 99 (2003), 203–208.

[21] O. Kounchev, H. Render, *New methods in Geometric Modelling and Controlling Exponential Processes,* Proceedings of the Nato Advanced Research Workshop: Scientific Support for the Decision Making in the Security Sector, Velingrad, Bulgaria, 21–25.10.2006, (2007), 144–179.

[22] G.G. Lorentz, *Bernstein polynomials,* Chelsea Publishing Company, New York 1986 (2nd edition).

[23] E. Mainar, J.M. Peña, J. Sánchez-Reyes, *Shape preserving alternatives to the rational Bézier model,* Comput. Aided Geom. Design 18 (2001), 37–60.

[24] M.-L. Mazure, *Bernstein bases in Müntz spaces,* Numerical Algorithms 22 (1999), 285–304.

[25] M.-L. Mazure, *Blossoms and optimal bases,* Adv. Comput. Math. 20 (2004), 177–203.

[26] M.-L. Mazure, *Chebyshev Spaces and Bernstein bases,* Constr. Approx. 22 (2005), 347–363.

[27] M.-L. Mazure, *On the Hermite Interpolation,* C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, 340 (2005), 177–180.

[28] M.-L. Mazure, H. Pottmann, *Tchebycheff curves.* Total positivity and its applications (Jaca, 1994), 187–218, Math. Appl., 359, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1996.

[29] S. Morigi, M. Neamtu, *Some results for a class of generalized polynomials,* Adv. Comput. Math. 12 (2000), 133–149.

[30] J.M. Peña, *On the optimal stability of bases of univariate functions,* Numer. Math. 91 (2002), 305–318.

[31] J.M. Peña, *On Descartes' rules of signs and their exactness,* Math. Nachr. 278 (2005), 1706–1713.

[32] L. Ramshaw, *Blossoming: A Connect-the-Dots Approach to Splines,* Systems Research Center, Digital Equipment Corporation (1987).

[33] L.L. Schumaker, *On hyperbolic splines*, J. Approx. Theory 38 (1983), 144–166.

[34] W.B. Temple, *Stieltjes integral representation of convex functions,* Duke Math. J. 21 (1954), 527–531.

[35] J. Zhang, *C-curves: an extension of cubic curves,* Comput. Aided Geom. Design 13 (1996), 199–217.

J. M. ALDAZ: DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID, CANTOBLANCO 28049, MADRID, SPAIN.

E-mail address: `jesus.munarriz@uam.es`

O. KOUNCHEV: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 8 ACAD. G. BONCHEV STR., 1113 SOFIA, BULGARIA.

E-mail address: `kounchev@gmx.de`

H. RENDER: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN, DUBLIN 4, IRELAND.

E-mail address: `render@gmx.de`